

Date and Time Submitted:					
Name:		Meeting Date:	Comment Type:	Agenda Item:	Comments:
6/10/2014 7:23		David Moty	Non-Agenda Comment		<p>Commissioners:</p> <p>At its May 12, 2021 meeting, the Kensington Talmadge Planning Group approved the following motion on a 13-1 vote: The KTPG desires that Kensington and Talmadge are kept together in the same City Council district and that our communities are kept wholly intact, including all the areas currently included in our community plan boundaries. Furthermore, we prefer to remain combined with the immediately adjacent areas to the east, west, and south of us. The areas to our east, west and south tend to share our same issues with aging and inadequate infrastructure, and have followed many of the same development patterns as our community. As you may note from its omission, we believe the areas to our north do not share these same concerns and history.</p> <p>Respectfully yours, David K. Moty Chair, Kensington Talmadge Planning Group</p>

6/4/2021 18:15	Brian Reschke		Non-Agenda Comment	<p>Subject: Rancho Penasquitos Planning Board Response to Rancho Penasquitos Town Council Redistricting Subcommittee's March 1, 2021 letter.</p> <p>Dear Redistricting Commissioners,</p> <p>In response to the recent March 1, 2021 Rancho Penasquitos Town Council Redistricting Committee letter sent to the City of San Diego Redistricting Commission, the Rancho Penasquitos Planning Board (RPPB) desires to make it clear the RPPB was not informed of, nor given the opportunity to review or comment in advance, the content of the March 1, 2021 letter sent from the RP Town Council Redistricting Committee to the City of San Diego Redistricting Commission.</p> <p>The Rancho Penasquitos Planning Board is the formal established community planning group recognized by the City of San Diego and as such, a separate and independent redistricting committee had been established under the auspices of the Planning Board. It is our desire that the City Redistricting Commission clearly understand that any and all RPPB Redistricting Subcommittee efforts and communications with the Commission continues to be independent from the Rancho Penasquitos Town Council Redistricting Committee.</p> <p>Sincerely yours,</p> <p>Brian Reschke, Chair Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board CC: District 6 ChrisCate@sandiego.gov</p>
----------------	---------------	--	--------------------	---

6/2/2021 19:44	Pat Sexton		Non-Agenda Comment	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I wanted to commend Roy MacPhail for giving the most comprehensive presentation since, I can't remember when. Most of the time when someone from the City is presenting something we have to read between the lines and wonder what they're leaving out, that will hit us in the face, down the road. I didn't get that feeling with Roy's presentation. For that I thank both of you.</p> <p>I've tried to find the map application that would tell me what the population would be if a section of D3 was moved to D8 for example. Has that capability been provided, or is it in the works?</p> <p>My suggestions on moving the District boundaries around would be; 1) move the NE part of D3 boundary, that currently crosses over to the east side of 805, back to the west side of 805 and let 805 be the natural boundary for D3 and the population east of 805 would be D9. And/or on the south end of D3, move the boundary north to Market or G Street and to the south would be D8.</p> <p>Again, thank you for the presentation and I look forward to a return attendance and update.</p> <p>Pat</p>
6/2/2021 15:26	Howard Wayne		Non-Agenda Comment	<p>While I understand your meetings are preliminary to the release of detailed census data, I would like to get the Commission thinking about the integrity of communities. Prior to the current districting the entirety of Linda Vista was in a single council district. For reasons not made clear to Linda Vista, the current districting splits Linda Vista between two council districts. Similarly our neighbor Clairemont was split between two council districts.</p> <p>When the Commission comes to drawing lines, I hope it will respect the integrity of communities and not diminish the clout of Linda Vista that has major socio-economic needs.</p> <p>Howard Wayne Interim Chair of the Linda Vista Planning Group The opinion expressed are my own as our Planning Group has not yet taken a position.</p>

3/31/2021 18:01	Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters		Written materials mailed.	<p>Dear City of San Diego Redistricting Commissions,</p> <p>Greetings. My name is Kate Glenn, president of the Rancho Peñasquitos Town Council, a non-profit organization comprised of 16 elected and appointed representatives from the community of Rancho Peñasquitos (“RP”). This communication herein is submitted on behalf of our RPTC Redistricting Committee Chair, Mr. Ralph Peters.</p> <p>San Diego Redistricting Commissioners,</p> <p>Most of RP is presently in District 5, along with Rancho Bernardo, Sabre Springs, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Black Mountain Ranch, Torrey Highlands, and Rancho Encantada (Scripps).</p> <p>Unfortunately, in 2011, the southern section of RP, comprising the Park Village community and an area south of Adolphia Street (approximately 16% of total RP population), was split off from the rest of RP. As would be expected, having our community broken up this way has caused no end of community dissatisfaction, and we believe it is time to set this injustice right.</p> <p>And it would be simple to do so. While we do not have the 2020 census data yet (and won’t likely until late May or June), a community grouping of all of Rancho Penasquitos, Rancho Bernardo, Sabre Springs (“SS”), Carmel Mountain Ranch (“CMR”), Black Mountain Ranch (“BMR”), and Torrey Highlands (“TH”), should put us population-wise within a whisker of the projected per-district population goal (161,000). Our reasons are set forth below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. ‘RP’ is split and should not have been split. The statutory guidance provided the Redistricting Commission is that they are not NOT DIVIDE communities, if at all possible. It is time to cure this glaring defect in the 2011 plan.2. Most owners in ‘RP’ live here because they want to be part of the Poway Unified School District
-----------------	-----------------------------	--	---------------------------	---

3/31/2021 18:01	Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters		Written materials mailed (Continued)	<p>3. ("PUSD") and the diverse ethnic and cultural attractions of the constituent PUSD communities.</p> <p>4. All of the communities listed above – RB, SS, CMR, Torrey Highlands - are part of PUSD. Importantly, Mira Mesa is part of the San Diego Unified School system, which has its own proud traditions and rivalries.</p> <p>5. The local rivalries for the children of 'RP" involve the other communities in the PUSD core. Examples of these include: Football games; Wrestling matches Band competitions Cheerleading Basketball Science Olympiad Academic Bowl competitions Various travel teams in soccer, baseball, Pop Warner, etc.</p> <p>6. Many 'RP" Boy and Girl Scout Troops have members from BMR, CMR, SR, TH, and/or RB.</p> <p>7. Income levels in 'RP" are within a hairsbreadth of the other PUSD communities.</p> <p>8. The PUSD communities are all contiguous and have no natural boundary separator. 'RP" is separated from MM by the in places half mile wide Penasquitos Canyon.</p> <p>9. Our crime statistics are similar – far less than Mira Mesa.</p> <p>10. Most 'RP"-ers do their shopping locally or in CMR, not Mira Mesa.</p> <p>11. Many of us worship in RB.</p> <p>12. It is a fact that a large number of 'RP" residents moved out of MM to be part of the PUSD, to move up to the newer housing in 'RP", and be part of the vibrant cultural and ethnic milieu that 'RP" shares with the PUSD communities. MM has (a) older and smaller (by square footage) housing stock; (b) their housing sells for far less than 'RP" (on average, 25% less); (c) MM has a far higher percentage of renters; (d) MM has more than 10,500 rental apartments - almost three times that of 'RP". It is not only apartments that are being rented – it is important to point out that MM has far less Owner-occupied dwellings than 'RP".</p>
-----------------	-----------------------------	--	--------------------------------------	---

3/31/2021 18:01	Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters		Written materials mailed (Continued)	<p>In addition, MM has (e) a significantly lower per capita household income; (g) is far denser in terms of population, and (f) also has a higher crime rate. Lastly, MM is an older, poorly planned community, with very few parks, horrible traffic flow, older infrastructure, and poor drainage. Aside from their absence from the PUSD school system, their markedly different demographics, housing stock, density, and high percentage of renters dictates that the MM community has other issues, problems, and priorities than the PUSD core communities. It needs a dedicated council representative and staff that can focus on MM's disparate and unique set of problems.</p> <p>I thank you for your attention to the above. The RPTC Redistricting Committee will be providing additional correspondence and backup data supporting our community's position on redistricting.</p> <p>Yours,</p> <p>Ralph Peters Ralph Peters, Chair, RP Town Council Redistrict Committee Email: rptcredistrict21@gmail.com</p> <p>Kate Glenn Kate Glenn, President, RP Town Council</p> <p>cc: RPTC Redistricting Committee Secretary</p>
3/18/2021 8:53	Diana Martini	3/18/2021	Agenda Item Comment	7 Upper portion of district 6 including park village and homes off salmon river rd should be in district 5, not 6... area referenced in district 6 is part of PUSD... revise now!